

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No. 09/842,763	Applicant(s) ARAKAWA ET AL.	
	Examiner Barry J. O'Brien	Art Unit 2183	

All Participants:

(1) Barry J. O'Brien.

(2) Scott Wakeman.
Status of Application: ____

(3) ____

(4) ____

Date of Interview: 13 April 2004
Time: 2:00pm EST
Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.
Rejection(s) discussed:

None

Claims discussed:

9-11

Prior art documents discussed:

None

Part II.
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.


(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The Examiner contacted the Applicant regarding newly added claims 9-11. The Examiner felt that these claims were identical to the originally filed claims 1-3, which were amended to be claims 2-3, and have been indicated as allowable. The Examiner proposed canceling these claims, which he thought had been added erroneously, so that the application could proceed to allowance. The Applicant agreed that newly filed claims 10 and 11 were identical to the originally filed claims 2 and 3. However, the Applicant pointed out that there is a difference between the originally filed claim 1 and the original claim 9, specifically that claim 9 outputs "to an external host", whereas original claim 1 simply recited outputting "externally". The Applicant further noted that he would not be willing to cancel these claims at this time, and that the Examiner would have to provide a rejection of the claims, which would be considered before taking further action. The Examiner then stated he would send out such an action.